THE SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF MINISTERS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1985

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN): Madam, I beg to move:

> "That the Bill further to amend the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1952, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

If the hon. Members were to go through the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it in fact summarises the basis on which this Bill has been brought and passed in the Lok Sabha. The Bill seeks—

> (a) to provide that Ministers shall be entitled to a salary, daily allowances and constituency allowance at the same rates as a Member of Parliament;
>
> (b) to increase the amount payable to Ministers by way of sumptuary allowance and exempt from income-tax the value of the official residence provided to a Minister; and
>
> (c) to extend the facility of free travel in respect of six return journeys per year within India to one member of the family of a Minister accompanying him on such journeys.

These are the objects that we have in view. I do not think it requires any more elucidation and I commend the Bill for the consideration of the House.

The question was proposed.

SHRI S. W. DHABE (Maharashtra): Madam, here the word used is "constituency allowance". Members of Parliament, when they are not attending the Session, do not get any daily allowance. Are the Ministers entitled to it when they are on tour? Whether this will be in addition to the daily allowance or any other allowance, when they go on tour?

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: I think this position is absolutely clear. They are being treated as on duty throughout the year. On that basis whatever allowances are there, they will be entitled to them.

SHRI S. W. DHABE: My question was different. Whether it will be in addition to that.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): I have a fundamental objection to equating Ministers with Members of Parliament. Mr. Chavan has proved to be very clever in this. As regards emoluments, allowances etc. he is comparing with the Members of Parliament. But when it comes to the free things, he is not mentioning about anything. Ministers are Ministers and there is no question of treating them at par with Members of Parliament only in this respect. If they are at par, they should be at par in every thing. There is no need to compare them with Members of Parliament. They should have been separately described and their emoluments should have been treated separately.

Secondly, as regards sumptuary allowance, I do not find any justification for a difference between the amounts provided for a Minister of State and a Deputy Minister, because, after all, this allowance is spent on entertainment and the number of visitors does not always depend on the status of the Minister. In fact, junior Ministers get many more visitors than the senior Ministers because the latter are not easily approachable and are also not available. I feel that the sumptuary allowance must be equal at least for Ministers of State and the Deputy Ministers, if not equal with the Cabinet Ministers.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now I think it is time for Mr. Ghulam Nabi Azad and Shri Kesri to thank you.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Two points are absolutely clear, if the hon.

Members were to go through the reasoning as to what should have been the basis which we could have adopted for equating the salaries and allowances of Members and Ministers. Madam, the basis has been that ultimately every Minister is a Member of Parliament. So, he is to be given the same facilities which are otherwise available to all Members of Parliament excepting when he has to reside in Delhi he is to be provided with a house and other facilities. So, this is what has been attempted.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You want to have best of both the worlds!

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And then, you know, there is always the the chance of reverting back as a Member of Parliament. These are the hazards.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Don't wish him that!

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: About the other point which the honourable Member has suggested, I think he better come and sit in the chambers of the Cabinet Minister, Minister of State and Deputy Minister, and he will immediately realize what difference it is. Sumptuary allowance is something which, in fact, has to be given to all the Cabinet Ministers because there are so many delegations and so many other people who have to be entertained—not because we like it... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: I didn't say 'No' to you.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: In fact, it would have been better if we could have provided to others, but as things stand this is how it has been finalized and I don't think it needs any more justification.

I again commend this Bill for the consideration of the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1952, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 5 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Madam, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The motion was adopted.

THE PRESIDENT'S PENSION (AMENDMENT) Bill, 1985.

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN: Madam, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to amend the President's Pension Act, 1951, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Madam, there are only two provisions which we have provided in this Bill. One is to increase the salary of the President from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 15,000 per mensem and the other is to increase the pension from 15,000 to Rs. 30,000 per annum. These are the ony two amendments that we have.

I commend this Bill for the consideration of the House.

The question was proposed.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, the President is the Head of the State and whatever we give him should be respectable enough. In consequence